

# EXHIBIT C

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Case No. 05-44481-rdd

-----x

In the matter of:

DPH HOLDINGS CORP., et al.,

Reorganized Debtors.

-----x

United States Bankruptcy Court

One Bowling Green

New York, New York

April 1, 2010

10:44 AM

B E F O R E:

HON. ROBERT D. DRAIN

U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

212-267-6868

516-608-2400

2

1

2 HEARING re Reorganized Debtors' Emergency Motion for Order  
3 Under Section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, Fed. R. Bankr. P.  
4 7004(a) and 9006(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) Extending  
5 Deadline to Serve Process for Certain Avoidance Actions

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Transcribed by: Lisa Bar-Leib

VERITEXT REPORTING COMPANY

212-267-6868

516-608-2400

1

2 A P P E A R A N C E S :

3 BUTZEL LONG P.C.

4 Attorneys for DPH Holdings Corp., Reorganized Debtors

5 380 Madison Avenue

6 22nd Floor

7 New York, NY 10017

8

9 BY: ERIC B. FISHER, ESQ.

10

11 TOGUT, SEGAL & SEGAL LLP

12 Attorneys for DPH Holdings Corp., Reorganized Debtors

13 One Penn Plaza

14 New York, NY 10110

15

16 BY: DANIEL F.X. GEOGHAN, ESQ.

17

18 MILLER, CANFIELD, PADDOCK AND STONE, P.L.C.

19 Attorneys for Kostal of America Inc. and also Kostal

20 Mexicana S.A. de C.V.

21 150 West Jefferson

22 Suite 2500

23 Detroit, MI 48226

24

25 BY: DONALD J. HUTCHINSON, ESQ.

1

2 ROBINSON & COLE LLP

3 Attorneys for Prudential Relocation, Prudential Relocation

4 Incorporated, Prudential Relocation International

5 1055 Washington Boulevard

6 9th Floor

7 Stamford, CT 06901

8

9 BY: NATHAN C. ZEZULA, ESQ.

10

11 HONIGMAN MILLER SCHWARTZ & COHN LLP

12 Attorneys for Affinia Canada Corp., Itapsa S.A. de C.V., a

13 Mexican company, and Wix Filtration Products Europe

14 Limited and Valeo Schalter und Sensoren GMBH

15 2290 First National Building

16 660 Woodward Avenue

17 Detroit, MI 48226

18

19 BY: JUDY B. CALTON, ESQ.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2 BODMAN LLP

3 Attorneys for Freudenberg-NOK General Partnership,  
4 Freudenberg-NOK, Inc., Flexitech Inc. and Vibracoustic of  
5 Mexico, S.A. de C.V.

6 1901 St. Antoine Street

7 6th Floor at Ford Field

8 Detroit, MI 48226

9

10 BY: RALPH E. McDOWELL, ESQ.

11 (TELEPHONICALLY)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1                   THE COURT: All right. But I have to say -- excuse  
2 me. There was a motion filed then. And it wasn't a motion to  
3 deceive. All right? I would not have approved a motion to  
4 deceive. It was a motion signed off on by the unsecured  
5 creditors' committee saying that there's a recognition that  
6 there's a two year statute of limitation and also recognizing  
7 that, at the time, the plan was going to pay creditors a  
8 hundred cents on the dollar and that it didn't really make  
9 sense for creditors to have to hire people like you to defend  
10 them in a situation where it was likely to be moot.

11                   MR. HUTCHINSON: It could --

12                   THE COURT: And it was on very wide notice. I accept  
13 that it wasn't on notice to your client. But there were lots  
14 and lots of potential recipients of references who got actual  
15 notice of it. And there were no objections. Everyone was  
16 delighted not to be sued. They understood.

17                   MR. HUTCHINSON: Well, but it could have been  
18 accomplished in -- the steps that were taken were not -- one,  
19 the papers were filed under seal. Two, the Court was  
20 instructed to issue a summons --

21                   THE COURT: The adversaries were filed under the  
22 seal --

23                   MR. HUTCHINSON: Right.

24                   THE COURT: -- not the motion for approval of it.

25                   MR. HUTCHINSON: No. I understand that. But let me

1 say, there were three steps taken. One was to file the  
2 documents under seal. The second was to defer the issuance of  
3 the summons. And the third was to defer the time period for  
4 the debtor to file -- or to serve the summons and complaint.  
5 The latter two steps were the only two things that were  
6 necessary to accomplish the laudatory purpose of not requiring  
7 the debtors and defendants to engage in litigation that might  
8 never be pursued. There was no reason --

9 THE COURT: What's the first thing --

10 MR. HUTCHINSON: -- to seal the documents.

11 THE COURT: What's the first thing a client does when  
12 it gets a summons and a complaint?

13 MR. HUTCHINSON: Investigates the matter.

14 THE COURT: And hires a lawyer.

15 MR. HUTCHINSON: And hires a lawyer.

16 THE COURT: All right.

17 MR. HUTCHINSON: But if the clients had been notified  
18 that complaints had been filed but they might not be pursued,  
19 that the Court has authorized and directed that summons shall  
20 not be issued and that the debtors are not going to be required  
21 to file and serve a summons because the debtors might never be  
22 pursuing these actions, that is something that gives notice to  
23 the potential defendants that there might be a lawsuit down the  
24 road and if they need to take steps to preserve their knowledge  
25 and record, they should do so. Or if they want to take steps